



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,940	09/19/2003	John Burgess	105479-58348 (644-033)	7083
26345	7590	01/22/2010		
GIBBONS P.C. ONE GATEWAY CENTER NEWARK, NJ 07102			EXAMINER RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/22/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDocket@gibbonslaw.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/666,940

**Applicant(s)**

BURGESS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Andy S. Rao

**Art Unit**

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/200)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-22, 24-33, and 35-40 as filed on 11/11/09 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 21-22, 24-32, 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Shaffer") in view of Rudkin et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Rudkin"), and further in view of Unger et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Unger").

Shaffer discloses video conferencing system (Shaffer: figure 1), comprising: a video server having a video input port for receiving a source video signal appearing on a video output port of an initiating computer (Shaffer: column 3, lines 45-50), the video server transforming the source video signal into a video server output signal having a format suitable for communication over the Internet (Shaffer: column 3, lines 65-67); a plurality of remote computers, each of the remote computers executing a respective browser application to access the video server via an Internet address associated with the video server (Shaffer: column 4, lines 35-45); and the video server downloading the video server output signal to each of the remote computers upon its respective access to the video server (Shaffer: column 5, lines 15-25), wherein each of the

remote computers transforming the downloaded video server output signal into a display signal suitable for viewing on a display device associated with that remote computer wherein a representation of the source video signal at the initiating computer is viewable on each of the plurality of remote computers (Shaffer: column 6, lines 10-20), as in claim 21. However, even though Shaffer discloses access by the internet, it fails specifically disclose assigning the video server a specific internet address (i.e. a URL or link) and subsequent access through said address, computers upon its respective access to the video server, wherein access requires confirmation by the video server of authentication and security authorization information entered at the remote computer by respective first and second encryption techniques, as in the claim. Rudkin discloses assigning a video server a specific internet address (Rudkin: paragraph [0081], lines 1-35), wherein access requires confirmation by the video server of authentication and security authorization information entered at the remote computer (Rudkin: paragraph [0072], lines 5-12), in order to allow for personalized multi-media delivery across remote networks (Rudkin: paragraph [0005], lines 1-10). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to take the Rudkin disclosure of address server designation into the Shaffer disclosure in order to have its video accessible and addressable by remote users to allow for personalized multi-media delivery across remote networks. The Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation, has a majority of the features of 21, but fails to disclose the use of first and second encryption techniques, as in the claim. Unger discloses the use of dual encryption techniques (Unger: column 5, lines 50-60) for server access and delivery of video programs (Unger: column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-21) in order to provide video content to only authorized viewers or

subscribers (Unger: column 19, lines 30-65). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further incorporate the Unger teaching use dual encryption techniques into the Shaffer-Rudkin combination in order to allow of video content delivery to only authorized users of the system. The Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, has all of the features of claim 21.

Regarding claim 22, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein the source video signal is received from the initiating computer via a communications path that does not provide signal processing to the source video signal (Shaffer: column 3, lines 35-40), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 24, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein one of the plurality of remote computers has at least one associated input device selected from the group consisting of a keyboard and a mouse for entering input signals (Shaffer: column 5, lines 20-45), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 25, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein the input signals coupled from the at least one input device are supplied in response to prompts displayed on the display device associated with that one computer (Shaffer: column 7, lines 10-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 26, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein downloading of the video server output signal by the video server is a type from the group consisting of multicasting and broadcasting (Shaffer: column 1, lines 5-20), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 27-28, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses the video server utilizes a compression algorithm in transforming the source video signal into the video server output signal (Shaffer: column 3, lines 25-35), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 29, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein the video server output signal is encrypted by the video server prior to downloading to each of the plurality of remote computers (Shaffer: column 8, lines 55-65), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 30, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein the video server downloads a software application to those of the plurality of remote computers that do not have this software application (Shaffer: column 4, lines 5-20) already resident thereon (Shaffer: column 6, lines 20-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 31, the Shaffer system, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein the video output port is one selected from the group consisting of VGA, SVGA, S-video, and composite video and the source video signal has a signal format corresponding to the selected video output port (Shaffer: column 4, lines 30-40), as in the claim.

Shaffer discloses a method for video signal transmission (Shaffer: figures 3-7), comprising the steps of: providing a source video signal at a video output port of an initiating computer to a video input port of a video server (Shaffer: column 3, lines 45-50) to an internet address (Shaffer: column 4, lines 30-40); transforming the source video signal into a video server output signal having a format suitable for communication over the Internet (Shaffer: column 3, lines 65-67); downloading the video server output signal to each of a plurality of remote computers, each of the remote computers executing a respective browser application to access the video server via an Internet address associated with the video server (Shaffer: column 4, lines 35-45); and the video server downloading the video server output signal to each of the remote computers that access the video server via its Internet address using respective browser applications executing on that remote computer (Shaffer: column 5, lines 15-25), transforming the downloaded video server output signal into a display signal at each of the plurality of remote computers that is suitable for viewing a representative image of that on a display device associated with that remote computer wherein a representation of the source video signal at the initiating computer is viewable on each of the plurality of remote computers (Shaffer: column 6, lines 10-20), as in claim 32. However, even though Shaffer discloses access by the internet, it fails specifically disclose assigning the video server a specific internet address (i.e. a URL or link) and subsequent access through said address, authenticating a remote computers security authorization information entered at the remote computer, and provide authenticated security authorization using respective browser applications executing on that remote computer using first and second encryption techniques, respectively, as in the claim. Rudkin discloses assigning a video server a specific internet address (Rudkin: paragraph [0081], lines 1-35), and

authenticating a remote computers security authorization information entered at the remote computer and provide authenticated security authorization using respective browser applications executing on that remote computer (Rudkin: paragraph [0072], lines 5-14), in order to allow for personalized multi-media delivery across remote networks (Rudkin: paragraph [0005], lines 1-10). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to take the Rudkin disclosure of address server designation into the Shaffer disclosure in order to have its video accessible and addressable by remote users to allow for personalized multi-media delivery across remote networks. The Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation, has a majority of the features of 32, but fails to disclose the use of first and second encryption techniques, as in the claim. Unger discloses the use of dual encryption techniques (Unger: column 5, lines 50-60) for server access and delivery of video programs (Unger: column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-21) in order to provide video content to only authorized viewers or subscribers (Unger: column 19, lines 30-65). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further incorporate the Unger teaching use dual encryption techniques into the Shaffer-Rudkin combination in order to allow of video content delivery to only authorized users of the system. The Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, has all of the features of claim 32.

Regarding claim 33, the Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein the



providing of source video signal to the video input port of the video server is done without any signal processing (Shaffer: column 3, lines 35-40), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 35, the Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses the authentication (Rudkin: paragraph [0072], lines 5-14) of whether each of the remote computers is authorized receive the video server output signal and, on if so, is such signal downloaded to that remote computer (Shaffer: column 5, lines 20-45), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 36, the Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, wherein the input signals coupled from the at least one input device are supplied in response to prompts displayed on the display device associated with that remote computer (Shaffer: column 7, lines 10-35), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 37, the Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein downloading of the video server output signal by the video server is a type from the group consisting of multicasting and broadcasting (Shaffer: column 1, lines 5-20), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 38-39, the Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, discloses wherein the video server utilizes a compression algorithm in transforming the source video signal into the video server output signal (Shaffer: column 3, lines 25-35), as in the claims.

Shaffer discloses a method for video signal transmission (Shaffer: figures 3-7), comprising the steps of: receiving a source video signal on a video input terminal of a video

server (Shaffer: column 3, lines 45-50), the source video signal being coupled to the video input terminal from a video output terminal of an initiating computer via communications path (Shaffer: column 4, lines 30-40); transforming the source video signal into a video server output signal having a format suitable for communication over the Internet (Shaffer: column 3, lines 65-67); and downloading the video server output signal to each of a plurality of remote computers accessing the video server (Shaffer: column 4, lines 10-30), each of the plurality of remote computers executing a respective browser application (Shaffer: column 5, lines 20-30) and accessing the video server via the Internet address associated with the video server (Shaffer: column 4, lines 35-45), as in claim 40. However, even though Shaffer discloses access by the internet, it fails specifically disclose assigning the video server a specific internet address (i.e. a URL or link) and subsequent access through said address, and accessing the video server after the video server authenticates the security authorization using first and second encryption techniques, respectively, as in the claim. Rudkin discloses assigning a video server a specific internet address (Rudkin: paragraph [0081], lines 1-35), accessing the video server after the video server authenticates the security authorization (Rudkin: paragraph [0072], lines 5-14) in order to allow for personalized multi-media delivery across remote networks (Rudkin: paragraph [0005], lines 1-10). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to take the Rudkin disclosure of address server designation into the Shaffer disclosure in order to have its video accessible and addressable by remote users to allow for personalized multi-media delivery across remote networks. The Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation, has a majority of the features of 40, but fails to disclose the use of first and second encryption

techniques, as in the claim. Unger discloses the use of dual encryption techniques (Unger: column 5, lines 50-60) for server access and delivery of video programs (Unger: column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-21) in order to provide video content to only authorized viewers or subscribers (Unger: column 19, lines 30-65). Accordingly, given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further incorporate the Unger teaching use dual encryption techniques into the Shaffer-Rudkin combination in order to allow of video content delivery to only authorized users of the system. The Shaffer method, now incorporating the Rudkin server address designation and the Unger teaching of dual encryption techniques, has all of the features of claim 40.

#### *Conclusion*

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Evans discloses methods and systems for providing per pixel security and functionality.
5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andy S. Rao  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2621

asr  
/Andy S. Rao/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621  
January 18, 2010